

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/646,788	NOMURA, HIROSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Arthur A Smith	2851	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arthur A Smith. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Bill Boshnick. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 28 December 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Model of the present invention as well as a model of the prior art.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 12 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nomura et al. (US 2001/0019458 A1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant has pointed out that the prior art of record fails to teach at least wherein: (claims 1, 12 and 19) the support ring supports an imaging component; (claim 12) wherein the cam groove has an open end such that a portion of said cam groove including said open end serves as said standby section; (claim 19) wherein said cam follower is disengaged from said cam groove through said open end when said linearly movable ring is positioned in said standby position. In light of applicant's arguments the examiner will review the present rejection as well as do an updated search before deciding on allowance.